

Topics:

- Sitewide Excavation Plan (SEP)
- Final Regrading of Site

Attendees:

CAB members:	Jim Bierer Marvin Clawson Pam Dunn Tereza Marks Doug Sarno Bob Tabor
DOE:	Robert Janke Kathi Nickel
Fluor Daniel Fernald:	J.D. Chiou Marc Jewett Tisha Patton Eric Woods
FRESH:	Carol Schroer Edwa Yocum
OEPA:	Tom Ontko

Results:

- Continuously updated map of site restoration and regrading

Meeting Summary:

The SEP is a two volume document that outlines the procedures and timeframe for site excavation activities. Remediation is done area by area, and the SEP is the guidance document for these activities. After remediation is completed in each area, restoration activities will begin. The process outlined in the SEP starts with a remedial design. Next, an integrated remedial design package (IRDP) is completed. The IRDP contains the specifics of the project which will allow contractors to bid on it. Then, excavation occurs; followed by precertification activities. Certification demonstrates that the cleanup has been completed. The certification documentation is then sent to USEPA and OEPA. After all of these activities are completed, actual restoration will be started.

Before the SEP was completed, Area 1 Phase I was certified. This was followed by certification for Area 2 Phase I and Area 1 Phase II; none of these areas required certification. FDF has not started activities in areas that will require excavation. In order to excavate those areas, FDF will have to perform sampling activities to assess the depth and extent of excavation required. The overall purpose of the SEP is to ensure every possibility is included in the design so that procedures will exist to deal with every possible circumstance.

J.D. Chiou showed a map of one of the potential options for final site restoration. The Community Reuse Organization (CRO) is currently working with 28 acres near the Access Road that will not be impacted by excavation activities. During remediation, several acres of wetlands will be impacted around the current plant area. Area 1 Phase I is being considered as a potential area for wetland mitigation. The current plant area may be left as a pond-like area because excavation activities will produce a deep depression that will be costly to refill. The area currently occupied by the Waste Pits may be left as a floodplain for Paddys Run. Doug Sarno requested color-coded maps to show areas that are certified, under excavation, etc. These maps would allow stakeholders to visualize the site as it changes.



During precertification, each area will be sampled to determine the extent of residual contamination. The sampling for certification will be defined as a result of precertification activities. Certification sampling will be conducted by a statistical approach. The footprint used during certification can be 250 feet by 250 feet or 500 feet by 500 feet. The smaller footprint is used when significant concentrations of contaminants existed before excavation. In each footprint, 16 samples are taken and 8-12 of those samples are analyzed. Using the information obtained from the sample analysis, the pattern of contamination is assessed and certification units are designed for compatibility with one another. Most of the certification samples will go off-site for analysis. FDF does have a mobile lab that will be used during excavation to make sure that all contaminated soil is removed. Samples will also be taken during excavation to show where material exceeds the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC). Visual inspections will also be performed by workers for above WAC material. Above WAC material will be separated near the excavation site. Bricks found in the soil will be considered above WAC material since acid brick must be disposed of off-site and cannot be distinguished easily from other brick.

In Area 2 Phase I, FDF is at the point of awarding the excavation contract. The IRDP for Area 1 Phase II has been sent to USEPA and OEPA for review. Area 8 Phase I will not need excavation. The actual completion dates for these areas are not known because the design packages will define later milestones. Area 2 Phase I will be the first area with large scale excavation. Many committee members were concerned about areas that are currently covered with buildings. After many of these buildings are dismantled, debris on the ground may prevent some areas from being tested. Perched water in other areas may also cause excavation problems. The committee was also concerned that excavation is very susceptible to budget cuts and would be one of the first projects to be pushed back.

After excavation, many of the deeper areas will not be backfilled but will be graded. Fundamentally, there will not be much backfilling, and most of the restoration will consist of grading. Doug Sarno expressed concern that by not backfilling, the site elevation would be lowered relative to the on-site disposal facility (OSDF). However, most areas of the site would be dropping less than 20 feet in height. Many areas will also have little or no excavation.

The final restoration plan for the site is not completed. DOE will need to get public input on the final appearance of the site. The Operable Unit Five (OU5) Record of Decision (ROD) left a variety of options open to the community. Although DOE must own the land, the ROD left the option of leasing the land outside of the OSDF and its buffer zone. The Natural Resource Restoration Plan (NRRP) lays out a plan similar to that described in this meeting. Some members felt that, considering that a lot of land will have to be used for wetlands and the OSDF, not a lot would remain for other uses. The current plan calls for the area to become an undeveloped park; Doug asked about access to this park. The current plan does not include trails or other paths, but there will be no physical barriers to access. The committee also wanted deed restrictions placed on the land, so it cannot be developed. Public input on the current plan will be sought through spring and summer.

In addition, the State of Ohio suit for Natural Resources has been resolved. A tentative settlement has been reached and public input is encouraged.

Tisha Patton provided the committee with a draft Table of Contents for the annual "Integrated Environmental Monitoring Plan" (IEMP) and a summary of the "Authorized Limits for Fernald Copper Ingots."